DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 443 493 JC 000 538

TITLE	Programs of Studies Leading to a Diploma of College Studies (DEC) in the Business Administration Technology and Cooperation Sectors.
INSTITUTION	Quebec Commission on the Evaluation of Collegiate Teaching (Quebec).
ISBN	ISBN-2-550-3170-6
PUB DATE	1996-04-01
NOTE	31p.
PUB TYPE	Guides - Non-Classroom (055)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Basic Skills; *Business Administration Education; *College Instruction; *Evaluation Criteria; Evaluation Methods; Foreign Countries; Higher Education; Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; *Self Evaluation (Groups); Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS	*Quebec

ABSTRACT

This report provides a guide for the evaluation of programs of studies leading to the Diploma of College Studies (DEC) in the Business Administration Technology and Cooperation Sector in Quebec. It provides an overview of topics of evaluation, self-evaluation procedure, indications on how to complete the self-evaluation report, each of the criteria and sub-criteria in context, the evaluation questions, and the supporting documents required. All of Quebec's 49 higher education institutions are authorized to offer the Business Administration Technology program. This is the vocational program with the largest number of students. Topics of evaluation include the quest to strike a balance between general education, basic administrative skills, and specialized administration skills; and the commitment to incorporating new information technology into the program components and learning activities. The self-evaluation report must include the following: a description of the self-evaluation procedure; a description of the program; self-evaluation of the program based on criteria such as program relevance, program coherence, value of teaching methods and student supervision, appropriateness of resource, program effectiveness, and quality of program management. At the end of the evaluation based on each of these criteria, the college shall provide an overall appraisal of the implementation of the program. A list of advisory board members and the institutions authorized to offer this degree are appended. (JA)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 443 493

Specific Guide
to the evaluation
of Programs of Studies

Programs of Studies Leading to a Diploma of College Studies (DEC) in the Business Administration Technology and Cooperation Sectors

This document was adopted in its original French version by the Commission d'évaluation de l'enseignement collégial at its 35th meeting in Québec City on April 1st, 1996.
Legal Deposit : 2nd Quarter 1996
National Library of Canada Bibliothèque nationale du Québec ISBN : 2-550-3170-6
© Gouvernement du Québec, Commission d'évaluation de l'enseignement collégial, Québec, Canada
Translation : Cabinet de traduction DIALANGUE inc.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
N. Levesque
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Table of contents

Introduction

Part one
Overview of the Programs and Topics of Evaluation

1. Program Overview

1.1 The *Business Administration Technology* program (410.12)
1.2 The *Administration et coopération* program (413.01)

2. Topics of Evaluation for the DEC Programs

2.1 Striking a balance between general education, basic administration skills, and specialized administration skills
2.2 Use of information technologies and computer science
2.3 Hands-on training
2.4 Student retention and graduation rates
2.5 Graduate placement rates by option
2.6 The relevance of program options

Part two
Carrying Out the Self-Evaluation Procedure

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

1. Standard Self-Evaluation Report Model

2. Criteria and Sub-criteria Used for Program Evaluation

Criterion 1 : Program relevance
Criterion 2 : Program coherence
Criterion 3 : The value of teaching methods and student supervision
Criterion 4 : The appropriateness of resources
Criterion 5 : Program effectiveness
Criterion 6 : Quality of program management

3. Overall Evaluation of Program Implementation

Appendix 1
Members of the advisory body

Appendix 2
Institutions authorized to offer programs leading to a DEC in *Business Administration Technology*

Introduction

In its *General Guide to the Evaluation of Programs of Studies*,[1] the Commission refers to its twofold objective of helping institutions constantly improve the quality and relevance of the education they offer, and reporting on the value of the instruction their students receive. The Commission's approach is based on the active participation of colleges and independent specialists.

It is through self-evaluation of a program that colleges set the evaluation procedure in motion. To assist them in doing so, the Commission has prepared, based on the *General Guide*, a *Specific Guide to the Evaluation of Programs of Studies* in conjunction with members of an advisory body composed of representatives of the college community and the labour market.[2] This specific guide has been prepared for the evaluation of programs of studies leading to a Diploma of College Studies (DEC) in the *Business Administration Technology* and *Cooperation* sectors, while another has been prepared for the evaluation of the Attestation of College Studies (AEC) in these sectors.[3]

The guide contains two parts. The first provides an overview of the programs and the topics of evaluation. The second, which sets out the self-evaluation procedure, provides indications on how to complete the self-evaluation report, describes each of the criteria and sub-criteria in context, lists the evaluation questions, and specifies the supporting documents required.

Part one

Overview of the Programs and Topics of Evaluation

1. Program Overview

This section provides a general overview of the main features of the two programs leading to a Diploma of College Studies (DEC) in the sectors evaluated, i.e. *Business Administration Technology* (410.12) and *Administration et coopération* (413.01) (this program is offered solely in French in Québec colleges).

1.1 The *Business Administration Technology* program (410.12)

The most obvious result of the in-depth review of the eight programs in the Business Administration sector completed in 1990 was their combination into a single program called *Business Administration Technology*. In its current form, this program is composed of a common core leading to seven options: *marketing, finance,* and *management*, which are offered in English in Québec colleges, and *personnel, gestion industrielle, transport*, and *assurances*, which are offered solely in French. The *management* option combines various training profiles, including "international commerce", "financial services", and "entrepreneurship", leaving the choice of optional courses to the colleges' discretion. However, only the *management* option is specified on the diploma.

The *Cahiers de l'enseignement collégial* specify that this program prepares students for highly diversified career perspectives, since each of the options are designed to meet specific needs on the labour market.(4)

This program has two sets of objectives. The first, which are more general, deal with the curriculum as a whole, while the second, more specific, target the respective options. In general, the goal of the program is to provide students with basic skills in mathematics and written and oral expression, as well as general training in business administration and a more specialized education in the option selected.

The *Business Administration Technology* program is composed of between 84 and 90 credits, broken down as follows: 26 credits in the *common, specific* and *complementary general education components*, and between 58 and 63 credits in the *specific program component*, 44 of which are chosen from a "common core" and between 14 and 19 of which are related directly to the option. All the common core courses are prescribed by the Minister and, as a general rule, all courses related to the option are chosen by the colleges from the list of courses established for this purpose in the *Cahiers de l'enseignement collégial*. For each option, an on-the-job training session or fieldwork course is offered among the courses listed.

All of Québec's 49 CEGEPs(5) are authorized to offer the *Business Administration Technology*program. The *finance, management* and *marketing* options are the most widely offered, by 46, 25 and 23 colleges respectively. The other options are much less widespread; three colleges offer *gestion industrielle* and *transport*, and two offer the *personnel* and *assurances* options. In the private sector, seven subsidized colleges are authorized to offer this program.

In 1993, a total of 12 749 students were enrolled in this program; of this number, 12 301 (96.5 %) were enrolled in public institutions. This is the vocational program with the largest number of students. When they are admitted to the program, students are not yet enrolled in an option; they

choose it later on in the program.

The number of graduates varies considerably from option to option; the *finance* option, the most widely offered in the college network, accounts for the largest number of graduates, with 1161 in 1993.

1.2 The *Administration et coopération* program (413.01)

Created in 1972, the *Administration et coopération* program has purposely maintained a certain distance from the *Business Administration Technology* (410.00) sector in order to place greater emphasis on its "cooperative spirit." This program was designed to meet the specific needs of the *Mouvement Desjardins*, but is also suitable for any institution active in the area of cooperation.

This program, which is composed of between 85 and 86 credits, includes 21 compulsory courses, 16 of which are also compulsory for students in the *Business Administration Technology*program, and six or seven courses chosen by the college. These optional courses include an on-the-job training session (fieldwork course) and a term project or final specialisation project.

Four private colleges and one CEGEP are authorized to offer the *Administration et coopération*program leading to a DEC. 154 students were enrolled in the DEC program in the fall 1993 term, 78 of them in first year.

2. Topics of Evaluation for the DEC Programs

2.1 Striking a balance between general education, basic administration skills, and specialized administration skills

The decompartmentalization of financial institutions, the globalization of financial markets, the increasing complexity of the knowledge to be acquired, the ever-widening range of duties entrusted to technicians in the field of administration, and the imperatives of being amenable to continuous upgrading call for a program that emphasizes a broad-based general education, comprising a good sense of judgment, analytical and synthetic skills, mastery of spoken and written French, knowledge of a second and even a third language, and communication and teamwork abilities. Such a program should also attach special importance to basic administration skills, without neglecting more specialized knowledge acquired through one of the *Business Administration Technology* options. A delicate balance must therefore be struck between general education in a broad sense, basic administration skills, and specialized administration skills. When this is achieved, the resulting education is sufficiently specialized to qualify students for a given occupation at the end of their college studies, and sufficiently general and basic to ensure their versatility within the limits of the subject field, a quality made increasingly indispensable by current and future labour market conditions. This program should definitely meet the needs of employers and employees alike in both the short and medium term.

This commitment to training technicians in administration who are capable of fulfilling employers' expectations in terms of versatility, prepared to adapt to the changing conditions of the labour market, and amenable to continuous knowledge upgrading, guided the 1990 review and the definition of current program objectives. Some five years later, the labour community harbours the same expectations with regard to new graduates from the *Business Administration Technology* program, a fact that is clearly expressed in the *Portrait de secteur*for this subject field, a document produced in 1995 by the MEQ's Direction générale de la formation professionnelle et technique

(DGFPT).[6]

Consequently, this quest to strike a balance among the main education components, particularly in terms of their dosage and complementarity, has been chosen as the first topic to be evaluated. From this perspective, we will attempt to determine whether the balance sought has been achieved, to what extent it has produced the desired results, and the progress still to be made in this area.

2.2 Use of information technologies and computer science

One of the important elements that emerged from the 1990 review was the need to continue reinforcing the aspect of the program dealing with information technologies. In this regard, the commitment to incorporating new information technologies into the program components and learning activities should be taken into consideration, especially in terms of the material resources available. It appears particularly advisable to look beyond current computer applications and examine the program with a view to implementing more recent sectors of information technology, such as telemarketing, cable shopping, and communication networks. A number of employers consulted during the preparation of the 1995 *Portrait de secteur*stressed the importance of mastering these new information technology skills.

2.3 Hands-on training

In its 1995 *Portrait de secteur*, the DGFPT stressed, with regard to the *commerce* and *management*[7] divisions, the invaluable nature of hands-on training that is acquired mainly through traditional on-the-job training sessions or the cooperative education format. This type of training has the advantage of providing future graduates with the professional experience they habitually lack when they first enter the labour market. It also offers colleges an ideal opportunity to maintain regular contacts with the labour community and to verify that the training they provide meets this community's needs.

It is high time to conduct an in-depth analysis of the application of on-the-job training sessions and the cooperative format to the *Business Administration Technology* program. On-the-job training sessions were first offered as part of the program six years ago.

A number of points should be considered with a view to defining the concrete conditions governing the organization and carrying out of this hands-on training and evaluating its effectiveness. Such an analysis should take into account where the sessions are carried out, the degree of satisfaction of the employers and trainees, and the respective advantages and drawbacks of on-the-job training sessions and the cooperative education format.

2.4 Student retention and graduation rates

In the *Business Administration Technology* program, the pass rates from one year to the next are usually lower than the average rates calculated for vocational DEC programs as a whole. In 1992-1993, the pass rate was 66.7 % from first to second year, 90.8 % from second to third year, and 62.7 % from third year to graduation, as compared to 74.3 %, 99.1 %, and 67.6 % respectively. Similarly, the proportion of graduates from the *Business Administration Technology*program as compared to the total number of graduates from vocational programs is usually lower than the average calculated for vocational DEC programs as a whole: for 1990, 1991 and 1992, they were 38.5 %, 42.9 %, and 40.2 %, as compared to 48.2 %, 49.2 %, and 47.8 % respectively.[8]

The graduation rate for first-time college students[9] calculated after three years was 21 % and 16 % for the 1990 and 1991 cohorts. These figures are comparable to those for the *Office Systems Technology* program (19 % and 21 % respectively), but higher than those for the *Data Processing/Computer Science* program (14 % for both cohorts).

Evaluation will provide accurate information on the student retention and graduation rates for the *Business Administration Technology* and *Administration et coopération* programs.

2.5 Graduate placement rates by option

Evaluation will help determine whether the formula implemented in 1990 has contributed to maintaining the higher-than-average employment rate observed in the *assurances* and *transport*options, and whether it has maintained or improved career perspectives for graduates in the *finance, marketing* and *personnel* options.[10] It would also be useful to determine the reasons for the high placement rate of graduates from the *Administration et coopération*program.

It is also important to analyze the reasons behind the decision made by a high proportion of graduates from the *Business Administration Technology* DEC program to pursue their studies, mostly at the university level. Is this a passing trend, caused by the difficult economic context, or a more deep-seated phenomenon, suggesting that students are deliberately choosing vocational training as a way of preparing for university ? Are all colleges affected in the same way ? Why do certain options appear to be more affected than others ?

2.6 The relevance of program options

In the wake of work begun by the MEQ, especially the 1995 *Portrait de secteur Administration, commerce et informatique*, changes have occurred or will occur in four of the seven options in the *Business Administration Technology* program, namely *assurances, gestion industrielle, personnel* and *transport*, and for the *Administration et coopération* program.

Assurances. In the 1995 *Portrait de secteur Administration, commerce et informatique*, it was proposed that life insurance should be more clearly distinguished from property insurance within the *assurances* option, or that this option should be turned into a separate program "to make the students in this sector more versatile while respecting the numerous regulations." [Translation]

Gestion industrielle. Originally designed as the specialized component of the *Industrial Engineering Technology* DEC program, this option was integrated into the *Business Administration Technology* program in 1990 while awaiting the setup of the *Industrial Engineering* program. Although this option was incorporated into this program in September 1994, it will remain as part of *Business Administration Technology* for a provisional period so as to enable students enrolled therein to complete their studies.

Personnel. In its *Portrait de secteur Administration, commerce et informatique*, the DGFPT recommends abolishing the *personnel* option, due mainly to the low placement rate of its graduates, based on a proposal made during the preparation of the 1990 review. Employers appear to prefer their university-educated equivalents.

Transport. The MEQ has decided to remove this option from the *Business Administration Technology* program and create a separate DEC program called *Logistique et distribution du transport*, scheduled to start up in September 1997.

DEC in Administration et coopération. Using another hypothesis advanced during the preparatory work for the 1990 review, the DGFPT recommends in its *Portrait de secteur* to "verify whether the operational and administrative duties specific to savings cooperatives are different to the extent that an entire DEC program is required to meet these needs." [Translation] This program has been in existence since 1972, enrollment is rising steadily, and graduates continue to enjoy a high placement rate in their field of training.

Evaluation must take this specific context into account. More specifically, it will enable the colleges to express their viewpoint on the maintenance of the current program structure, especially with regard to the options offered. Evaluation of the relevance of programs leading to a DEC is the responsibility of the MEQ, but the comments gleaned by the Commission will enable it to submit comments that will assist the Minister in this regard.

Part two
Carrying Out the Self-Evaluation Procedure

The evaluation the Commission is asking the colleges to carry out deals mainly with the specific program component of the *Business Administration Technology* and *Administration et coopération* programs. Thus, unless otherwise indicated, the following sub-criteria apply to the specific program component.

The self-evaluation procedure targets programs implemented in 1995-1996. In addition, analysis of the progression through school of students enrolled since 1991-1992 will be taken into account.

The college shall evaluate:[11]

- if it offers them, the two programs leading to a DEC, producing a self-evaluation report for each one or a combined report for both, as long as it makes the appropriate distinctions, especially as concern program coherence and effectiveness;
- for the *Business Administration Technology* program, all the options it offers.

1. Standard Self-Evaluation Report Model

The self-evaluation report must include the following:

- ***A description of the self-evaluation procedure***

The college shall provide information on work organization, responsibility sharing, the cooperation elicited, the consultations carried out, and the evaluation procedure used. If the college has formed an evaluation committee, the list of members as well as their respective positions should be included in this description.

The college shall indicate the procedure used to consult students, graduates, teachers, and other people involved in implementing the program.

- ***A description of the program***

In the general program description, the college shall indicate :

- the date the program was implemented;
- the options[12] offered;
- the number of teachers assigned to the specific program component (number and full-time equivalents);
- student population trends observed in the program over the past five years;
- the program's role in the institution's priorities or educational mission;
- development outlooks for the program.

It may also mention specific characteristics of the student population or with regard to program implementation, such as the use of the cooperative education format, and explain them in more detail elsewhere in the self-evaluation report.

The college shall consider this information when formulating its overall evaluation of the program implementation.

- ***Self-evaluation of the program***

To facilitate its analysis, the self-evaluation report must correspond to the order and numbering of the criteria and sub-criteria in this guide. Unless otherwise indicated, the reference year or cohorts for each evaluation question shall be those mentioned above.

In this guide, information that may prove useful for carrying out self-evaluation of the program is presented based on the following criteria :

1) program relevance
2) program coherence
3) value of teaching methods and student supervision
4) appropriateness of resources
5) program effectiveness
6) quality of program management.[13]

The criteria and sub-criteria are accompanied by an explanation putting the evaluation questions in context. For each *sub-criterion*, the college shall first outline the situation and then evaluate the aspects of the program implementation in question. It shall base its reasoning on the outline of the situation, but also include any other information it deems essential, as well as the actions it plans to take. It shall then enclose the documents required, as well as a description of the evaluation method used or a copy of the data-gathering tools employed to obtain the information necessary for its evaluation.

After evaluating each criterion, the college shall make a final decision and include any other comments it deems relevant. After evaluating all the criteria, it shall adopt an *overall decision* with regard to program implementation and identify its *action priorities* in terms of improving program quality.

Once the report has been approved by the board of directors, the college shall submit eight (8) copies of its self-evaluation report and the supporting documents to the Commission. The report

should not exceed 100 pages, excluding the appendices.

2. Criteria and Sub-criteria Used for Program Evaluation

CRITERION 1
Program relevance

This criterion links program objectives with educational/socioeconomic requirements. It aims to determine how the program, through its objectives and content, provides for ongoing analysis of the needs of the job market and takes the placement rate of graduates into account.

Sub-criteria 1.1 and 1.2, which appear in the *General Guide*, have been selected to evaluate program relevance.

Sub-criteria 1.1 and 1.2
The objectives and content of the program and the options available are consistent with the expectations and needs of the labour market and society.

The college shall establish links between labour market expectations and the options offered, where applicable. It shall evaluate how the general program objectives are used to fulfil these expectations and thereby develop graduates' employment potential.

The college shall report on how the institution's educational project is reflected in the program's implementation and indicate the changes or additions to be made to program objectives and content.

1. Identify the needs of the labour market which the program options aim to fulfil.

   Where applicable, distinguish between local and regional needs and province-wide needs.

   Indicate the contacts maintained with the labour market and program graduates.

2. Indicate the general skills and abilities sought by the labour market and society that the college has taken into account in its program.

   These general skills and abilities include: the ability to speak and write in both French and English and in a third language where possible, mastery of new information technologies, business ethics, a critical mind, openness to diversity, autonomy, entrepreneurship, the ability to adapt, etc.

3. Indicate :

- the job placement rate of graduates entering the labour market over the past three years, specifying the proportion of jobs in relation to the training received and, where applicable, to the option chosen, data permitting;

  distinguish between graduates and non-graduates.

- where available, quantitative data on the number of graduates who pursue university

studies;

present data by university program.

4. What is your evaluation of :

- the correlation between the expectations of the labour market and society and the options offered, local program objectives, and the general skills and abilities identified;

  consider the program as a whole (general and specific education components);

  emphasize the changes, adaptations, and additions made to the MEQ objectives or program content and, where applicable, future developments with regard to the options offered;

  take the opinions expressed by program graduates into account;

- the job placement rate of graduates;

- the proportion of students who pursue university studies?

Planned actions

Documents to be included

The main results of studies conducted on employers' needs and level of satisfaction.

The main results of graduate surveys conducted over the past three years.

Overall evaluation of program relevance

The college shall present an overall evaluation of the relevance of the program, briefly identifying the main strengths and weaknesses in terms of this criterion. It may also submit any comments it deems appropriate.

CRITERION 2
Program coherence

To ensure that a program of studies constitutes a quality education plan, it is essential that its elements form a coherent whole. The content and objectives of the learning activities must be a direct extension of program objectives. The learning activities should be interlinked based on well-defined themes in a logical, progressive sequence. The requirements specific to each learning activity, such as the degree of difficulty of the knowledge and skills to be acquired or the students' workload, must be established in a clear, balanced manner.

Sub-criteria 2.2, 2.3 and 2.4, which appear in the *General Guide*, have been selected to evaluate

program coherence. The expression "learning activities" designates courses in all their forms (lectures, laboratories, workshops, projects, on-the-job training sessions or fieldwork course, etc.).

Sub-criterion 2.2
The program, in its program-specific general education component and its specific program component, contains a series of learning activities whose objectives and content clearly reflect general program objectives and enable them to be met.

This sub-criterion is used to determine to what extent the objectives and content of the courses in the program-specific general education component and the specific program component reflect general program objectives.

1. Using the 1995-1996 school year, indicate the program objectives targeted for each course in the specific program component.

> *Group the courses according to whether they are prescribed by the Minister or chosen by the institution, and then list them according to the options offered.*

2. Indicate the criteria used by the college to choose optional courses.

3. Indicate whether the courses in the program-specific general education component reflect the program objectives.

> *Indicate whether the composition of classroom groups contributes to the achievement of program objectives.*

4. What is your evaluation of the contribution of learning activities to achieving general program objectives?

Planned actions

Sub-criterion 2.3
Learning activities in the specific program component are ordered logically and sequenced so as to facilitate progressively more detailed study and integration of the various program elements.

This sub-criterion is used to evaluate how the sequencing of the learning activities contributes to a progressive, integrated program, and to what extent the study and integration of the courses is made possible.

1. Insert the 1995-1996 organizational chart for each of the options and justify, where applicable, the existence of prerequisites.

2. What is your evaluation of the sequencing of learning activities from the beginning of the program through to the end?

> *Take into account where on-the-job training sessions and term projects are positioned in the program, how the options are sequenced in relation to the core courses, and any changes made to the sequence during the past two years.*

Planned actions

Sub-criterion 2.4
Specific requirements for each learning activity in the specific program component are realistically and clearly defined; these requirements are accurately reflected in course outlines and weighting.

This sub-criterion is used to evaluate the realism and balance of the curriculum requirements, which are reflected mainly in the number of hours of courses and laboratories, the personal projects assigned, and the number of hours of work required to complete them.

1. List the courses for which the weighting is different than that appearing in the *Cahiers de l'enseignement collégial*.

Indicate the weighting as it appears in the course outline and justify any changes made.

2. Indicate, based on the students' opinions, those courses for which the weighting of the personal workload (third number of the code) does not correspond to what appears in the course outline.

Provide figures on the differences.

3. What is your evaluation of the workload assigned to and carried out by the students?

Base your evaluation on the clearness and reasonableness of the requirements, as well as on the distribution of the workload during a given term and among all terms.

Take the students' opinion into account.

Planned actions

Documents to be included

The questionnaire or interview sheet used to ascertain the students' opinion.

Overall evaluation of program coherence

The college shall present an overall evaluation of the coherence of the program, briefly identifying the main strengths and weaknesses in terms of this criterion. It may also submit any comments it deems appropriate.

CRITERION 3
The value of teaching methods and student supervision

This criterion is used to assess the value of the teaching methods and student supervision as they relate to the program, the courses, and the characteristics of the student population.

The three sub-criteria which appear in the *General Guide* have been selected to evaluate this criterion.

Sub-criterion 3.1
Teaching methods are adapted to program and course objectives and take student characteristics into account.

This sub-criterion is used to describe the main methods employed to teach the courses in the specific program component, how they contribute to achieving program objectives, and how they correspond to the characteristics of the student population.

1. Describe the main teaching methods used in the program.

Explain any innovative or experimental teaching methods used.

2. What is your evaluation of the appropriateness of the teaching methods in light of program objectives and student characteristics?

Take the students' opinion into account.

Planned actions

Documents to be included

The questionnaire or interview sheet used to ascertain the students' opinion.

Sub-criterion 3.2
Guidance, support and follow-up services, screening measures to detect learning problems, and reception and integration activities enhance student success.

This sub-criterion is used to evaluate the effectiveness of the support measures used to help students pursue their studies and better succeed in the program.

The college is encouraged to place special emphasis on program-specific measures and, in the case of "college measures", on the role played by the "responsables du programme" in relation to the various college services (referral, follow-up of students during and after use of services, etc.).

1. Describe the measures implemented to help students overcome learning difficulties, stay in the program, and complete their studies.

These measures include screening for learning difficulties, student aid (remedial centres in French, mathematics, etc.), guidance and follow-up, reception and integration activities or sessions, remedial activities, tutoring, specialized workshops, etc.

Distinguish and emphasize program-specific measures.

Explain how the college informs the students of the existence of these measures and specify how they are actually used by students in the program.

Describe how program authorities and college services work together and specify the follow-up carried out by each.

2. What type of support is available to help students choose an option?

3. What is your evaluation of the result of these support measures, in particular those specific to the program, in light of student retention and academic success rates?

Take the students' opinion into account.

Planned actions

Documents to be included

The questionnaire or interview sheet used to ascertain the students' opinion.

Sub-criterion 3.3
Teachers' availability outside regular class hours meets students' need for supervision.

Formal and informal contacts between teachers and students constitute an important factor in student retention and success rates. This sub-criterion is thus used to verify whether students can rely on teacher availability to meet their supervision needs and whether they use this availability efficiently.

1. Indicate the average number of hours of student supervision provided by teachers outside regular class hours.

2. What is your evaluation of the teachers' availability and how it is used by students to meet their needs for supervision and learning assistance?

Take the students' opinion into account.

Planned actions

Documents to be included

The questionnaire or interview sheet used to ascertain the students' opinion.

Overall evaluation of the value of teaching methods and student supervision

The college shall present an overall evaluation of the appropriateness of its teaching methods and student supervision measures, briefly identifying the main strengths and weaknesses in terms of this criterion. It may also submit any comments it deems appropriate.

CRITERION 4
The appropriateness of resources

Program quality depends largely on the human, material and financial resources allocated to it, and on the links between the teachers' qualifications, skills and experience and the teaching load assigned to them. In addition, maintaining program quality calls for a high level of teacher motivation and sufficient material and financial resources.

Sub-criteria 4.1, 4.3, 4.4 and 4.5, which appear in the *General Guide*, have been selected to evaluate this criterion. Sub-criteria 4.4 and 4.5 have been combined.

Sub-criterion 4.1
The number and professional qualifications of teachers are sufficient and their skills are diversified enough to meet program objectives.

This sub-criterion is used to determine and evaluate the number, status and qualifications of the teaching staff assigned to the program.

1. List all the persons assigned to teach courses in the specific program component, according to their status, for the 1995-1996 school year.

	Teaching staff assigned to administration,business administration technology and cooperation courses in the program.			*Teaching staff assigned to supporting subjects in theprogram* *(e.g. mathematics, economics, computer science).*		
	Number			**Number**		
Status[14]	**men**	**women**	**total**	**men**	**women**	**total**
Permanent full-time						
Non-permanent full-time						
Permanent part-time						
Non-permanent part-time						
By lesson						
Total						

2. Present the main data on the training, experience and teaching load of the teachers assigned to courses in the specific program component for the 1995-1996 school year.

Teachers	**Level of schooling**		**Work experience**		
	Number of years	Degrees obtained or to be obtained (specify year) and professional designation	Number of years of recognized teaching experience	Other work experience (number of years and type)	Course number

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Teachers assigned to courses in administration/commerce, business administration technology, and cooperation					
1					
2					
3					
4					
...					
Teachers assigned to supporting disciplines					
1					
2					
3					
...					

3. List the criteria and procedure used to assign teaching duties.

4. What is your evaluation of the number and qualifications of the teachers, in light of program objectives and the teaching load assigned?

Planned actions

Sub-criterion 4.3
Teachers' motivation and skills are maintained and developed, among other things, through well-defined evaluation procedures and professional development activities.

Evaluation procedures, professional development activities and supervision are the ideal means for assessing, maintaining, and developing the motivation and skill levels of the teaching staff.

1. Describe the measures, rules or procedures governing:

- evaluation of the program teaching staff;
- professional development activities completed by program teaching staff;
- supervision of new teachers and lecturers.

2. Identify, for each teacher in the specific program component, the professional development activities completed over the past three years.

> *These activities may pertain to pedagogical development or to development in a specific subject field (the latter may be carried out in a business environment).*

Teachers	Professional development activities		
	Pedagogical	Specific subject	Business environment
1			
2			
3			
...			

3. What is your evaluation of the impact of evaluation procedures, professional development activities and supervision on teachers' motivation and skill levels?

Planned actions

Sub-criteria 4.4 and 4.5
Financial and material resources are sufficient to ensure that the program functions properly.

The college shall use these sub-criteria to identify the financial and material resources available to implement the program.

1. Identify the main material resources available to the program.

> *This may include computer or audiovisual equipment and material (specialized software), special premises, etc.*

2. Are the main material resources sufficient and accessible and is financing adequate to meet program requirements?

> *Present and develop the reasons justifying your answer.*

Planned actions

Overall evaluation of the appropriateness of resources

The college shall present an overall evaluation of the appropriateness of the human, material and financial resources devoted to the program, briefly identifying the main strengths and weaknesses in terms of this criterion. It may also submit any comments it deems appropriate.

CRITERION 5
Program effectiveness

This criterion is used to evaluate academic success and the extent to which program objectives are achieved.

Evaluation must focus on the quality of graduates' education, as well as on the college's ability to foster students' academic success, taking into account their level of preparation when they are admitted to the program. At this time, the institutional policy on program evaluation (IPPE) as applied to the *Business Administration Technology* program will also be evaluated, as will the students' secondary school average, the course success rate, and the graduation rate based on the duration of studies. Finally, the level to which graduates have mastered and integrated the relevant knowledge and skills will be appraised. Since these programs did not include a comprehensive examination at the time of the reference period, particular attention shall be paid to on-the-job training sessions (fieldwork course) or the term project (final specialisation project).

All the sub-criteria appearing in the *General Guide* have been used to evaluate this criterion.

Sub-criterion 5.1
Recruitment and selection measures allow the college to constitute a motivated student population capable of successfully completing the program.

This sub-criterion is used to determine how the college's recruitment and selection policies and practices enable it to constitute a student population with a reasonable probability of successfully completing the program.

1. Describe the student recruitment and selection measures.

> *Where applicable, refer to the admission policy or other college policies that apply in these situations.*

2. Describe the selection criteria.

3. What is your evaluation of the characteristics of the student population admitted, their motivation, and potential for success in the program?

Planned actions

Sub-criterion 5.2
The learning evaluation methods and tools applied in this program enable the college to determine how effectively program and learning activity objectives have been met.

The quality of this evaluation depends largely on the application of rules set out in the institutional policy on the evaluation of student achievement (IPESA) to ensure rigour, validity and fairness. The college shall evaluate the application of the IPESA in force during the 1995-1996 school year in the Accounting II (410-210-90) and Marketing (410-430-90) courses.

1. Describe the mechanisms selected to verify the application of the IPESA, especially as concerns fairness.

> *Take the department's evaluation rules into account.*

2. What is your evaluation of the effectiveness of the learning evaluation methods applied to the *Accounting II* and *Marketing* courses in adequately and fairly measuring the achievement of the objectives targeted?

Verify the fairness and equivalence of the evaluations carried out as well as the value of the various tools used to measure the achievement of learning objectives.

Planned actions

Documents to be included

- The department's evaluation rules formulated in keeping with the IPESA.
- The detailed outlines for the *Accounting II* and *Marketing* courses taught during the 1995-1996 school year.
- For each of these courses, a copy of the evaluation tools or outlines of the assignments to be completed and of the evaluation grids or marking keys and any other related document used for learning evaluation during the 1995-1996 school year.

Sub-criterion 5.3
The course success rate is satisfactory.

This sub-criterion is used to evaluate the students' academic success rate in the specific program component and for most courses in the general education component of the program, with a view to identifying courses with a high failure rate.

1. For the disciplines identified, determine the course success rate in the general education and specific program components.

Complete the following table.

Course success rate in the general education and specific program components over the past three years.

For each discipline studied, the college shall establish the ***list of courses*** *followed by the students enrolled in the program during the years specified in the table and indicate the success rate in each for cohorts A and B.*[15] *In all cases, including general education courses, the results of students enrolled in the program must be set out separately.*

Component	Discipline	Course number	Cohorts A and B 1991 [16]		Cohorts A and B 1992		Cohorts A and B 1993	
			A	B	A	B	A	B
General education	601 or 603	course no. 1						
		course no. 2						
		course no. 3 ... (etc.)						
	340 or 345	course no. 1... (etc.)						
	604 or 602	course no. 1... (etc.)						

Specific (supporting disciplines)	201	course no. 1... (etc.)						
	383	course no. 1... (etc.)						
	420	course no. 1... (etc.)						
Specific (mai.. disciplines)	401	course no. 1... (etc.)						
	410	course no. 1... (etc.)						
	413	course no. 1... (etc.)						

2. What is your evaluation of the success rate in the different course categories and, where applicable, of the measures taken to improve this rate in light of the characteristics of the student population?

Establish a link with the appropriateness of the teaching methods used, aid and support services, and teacher availability.

Planned actions

Sub-criterion 5.4
A satisfactory proportion of students complete the program within an acceptable time frame, given their student status (full-time or part-time) and characteristics.

This sub-criterion is used to describe and evaluate the progression of students from the time they are admitted to the program to when they graduate or drop out.

1. Describe the progression through school of the cohorts enrolled in the 1991, 1992 and 1993 fall terms using the following tables.

Progression of first-time students enrolled in the program
1991, 1992, and 1993 cohorts

Cohorts (autumn)	**Secondary school average** [17]		**Enrollment 1st term (N)**		**Re-enrollment rate in third term**[18] **(%)**		**Graduation rate in program**[19]			
							Prescribed duration (3 years)[20]		**Maximum observation period**	
	A[21]	B[22]	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B
1991										
1992										
1993										

Business Administration Technology program
Breakdown of diplomas awarded by option

Year	Option	Number of diplomas
1994	Option A . . .	
1995	Option A . . .	
1996 (if available)	Option A . . .	

Progression of first-time students enrolled in the program
Cohorts A and B : fall 1991, 1992 and 1993
(complementary data)

Phase	Year	Cohort A		Cohort B	
		N	%[23]	N	%
Enrolled in first term (fall term)	1991 1992 1993		100 100 100		100 100 100
Enrolled in second consecutive term of program[24] (winter term)	1991 1992 1993				
Enrolled in third consecutive term of program (fall term)	1991 1992 1993				
Enrolled in fifth consecutive term of program (fall term)	1991 1992 1993				
All core courses in the specific program component passed[25] (after three years, but without obtaining a DEC)	1991 1992 1993				
Graduate after 3 years	1991 1992 1993[26]				
Graduate after 4 years	1991 1992				

Graduate after 5 years	1991				

2. Present the data concerning the situation of students who have dropped out of the program.

Indicate for the past three years, for example, the real percentage of students who dropped out of college, the percentage of students who pursued studies at the same college in another field, and the percentage of students who pursued studies at another college.

Use only students from cohort A.

3. What is your evaluation of the progression through school of the cohorts studied and, where applicable, of the effectiveness of the measures taken by the college to improve the graduation rate for the program?

Planned actions

Sub-criterion 5.5
Graduates meet the established standards with regard to the achievement of program objectives.

The college shall evaluate to what extent the on-the-job training session or term project reflects the students' achievement of the program objectives. If students are allowed to choose between these activities, the college shall describe them both. The college shall also verify whether the evaluation methods and tools used for these learning activities are appropriate for measuring the achievement of their objectives.

1. Provide an overview of your "training session bank" or "fieldwork course bank ".

Show how training sessions are selected and how the bank of training sessions is made up.

Distinguish the training sessions based on the options offered, where applicable.

2. Describe how the training sessions or fieldwork courses are coordinated and supervised.

3. Do you consider that there are enough training sessions or fieldwork courses and that they offer learning situations that are varied enough to enable students to achieve the objectives set and to absorb the knowledge, skills and abilities taught?

4. Describe the term project or final specialisation project and the supervision provided to students.

5. What is your evaluation of the value of the training session (fieldwork course) or term project (final specialisation project) in measuring the achievement of the main program objectives?

Evaluate:

- the clarity and relevance of the objectives of these activities;
- the achievement of the different categories of program objectives and the level of difficulty of the training session;
- the various evaluation methods and tools used.

Planned actions

Documents to be included

The detailed outline of the on-the-job training session and the final specialisation project for the 1995-1996 school year, including the training session notebook or any other document explaining the objectives and procedure of these two activities.

Overall evaluation of program effectiveness

The college shall present an overall evaluation of the effectiveness of the program as it has been implemented, briefly identifying the main strengths and weaknesses in terms of this criterion and taking into account, where applicable, the options offered. It may also submit any comments it deems appropriate.

CRITERION 6
Quality of program management

The principles underlying program management, the definition of structures, the distribution of roles and responsibilities, and the effectiveness of interpersonal communication are essential to the success of the program, which is implemented as an integrated set of learning activities leading to the achievement of educational objectives.

Sub-criteria 6.1 and 6.3, which appear in the *General Guide*, have been selected to evaluate this criterion.

Sub-criterion 6.1
Management methods and structures and the existing means of communication are well-defined and promote the program's proper functioning as well as the program approach.

This sub-criterion is used to identify the agencies and individuals involved in program management, describe their respective roles, determine how various responsibilities are exercised, evaluate the extent to which these management methods and structures promote the program approach, and verify whether interpersonal communication is adequate and effective.

1. Describe the roles of the agencies and individuals involved in program management, identifying the aspects that promote the program approach.

> *Emphasize the participation of teachers from the specific program component and the program-specific general education component in program management.*

2. To what extent do the management methods and structures and the existing means of communication contribute to developing a shared vision of the program among those involved in its implementation?

Planned actions

Sub-criterion 6.3
Program descriptions are distributed and explained to students.

This sub-criterion is used to verify whether the college complies with section 17 of the College Education Regulations in force since fall 1995.[27]

1. Describe the methods used to inform students of program content and requirements.

2. Are the students adequately informed of program objectives and learning activities?

Explain your answer using the methods employed since fall 1995 as an example.

Take the students' opinion into account.

Planned actions

Documents to be included

The program description distributed to students.

Overall evaluation of the quality of program management

The college shall present an overall evaluation of program management, briefly identifying the main strengths and weaknesses in terms of this criterion. The sub-criterion selected by the Commission emphasizes the sharing of responsibilities, communication, and methods of promoting the program approach, but the college may also include any other elements it deems relevant to program management.

3. Overall Evaluation of Program Implementation

At the end of the evaluation based on each of these criteria, the college shall provide an overall appraisal of the strengths and weaknesses in the implementation of the program. In addition, the college shall evaluate the implementation of the program as a whole in light of its educational mission or the general or specific training objectives it has established.

In concluding its self-evaluation, the college shall identify:

- three elements of the program implementation that it considers strong points;
- three elements it considers weak points;
- its action priorities with regard to improving the quality of program implementation.

It may also submit its comments on the anticipated impact of the application of the *College Education Regulations* on the program, especially as concern the general education component

specific to the program.

Appendix 1
Members of the advisory body

Name	Position	Organization
Louis Roy	Commissaire	Commission d'évaluation de l'enseignement collégial
Paul Vigneau	Coordonnateur de projet	Commission d'évaluation de l'enseignement collégial
J.-Pierre Archambault	Enseignant	Collège de Bois-de-Boulogne
Rachel Bélanger	Enseignante	Collège Mérici
Johanne Bellemare	Coordonnatrice de la promotion	Carrefour Trois-Rivières Ouest
Claude Chayer	Directeur des études	Collège Lionel-Groulx
Marthe-Andrée Cloutier	Conseillère en formation et gestion du changement	Confédération des caisses populaires et d'économie Desjardins
Gilles Cossette	Conseiller en gestion	Gilles Cossette et associés
Marie Gagnon	Enseignante	Cégep de Lévis-Lauzon
Carol Lavoie	Directeur, Formation des adultes	Cégep de Sept-Iles
Jeannine McNeil	Enseignante	École des hautes études commerciales
Lise Truchon	Chef divisionnaire - Ressources humaines	Bell Canada

Appendix 2
Institutions authorized to offer programs leading to a DEC in *Business Administration Technology* (410.12)

List of institutions	Programs
PUBLIC SECTOR	

Cégep de l'Abitibi-Témiscamingue	Finance, gestion
Collège Ahuntsic	Marketing, finance, gestion industrielle
Collège d'Alma	Finance, gestion
Cégep André-Laurendeau	Marketing, finance, gestion, transport
Cégep de Baie-Comeau	Finance
Cégep Beauce-Appalaches	Finance
Collège de Bois-de-Boulogne	Marketing, finance, gestion industrielle, gestion
Champlain Lennoxville	Finance
Champlain Saint-Lambert	Marketing, finance
Champlain Saint-Lawrence	Marketing
Cégep de Chicoutimi	Marketing, finance, gestion
Collège de Dawson	Marketing, finance
Collège de Drummondville	Finance, gestion
Cégep Édouard-Montpetit	Marketing, finance
Cégep François-Xavier-Garneau	Finance, gestion, transport
Cégep de la Gaspésie et des Îles	Finance, gestion
Cégep de Granby Haute-Yamaska	Finance
Heritage College	Finance
John Abbott College	Gestion
Cégep Joliette - De Lanaudière	Marketing, finance
Cégep de Jonquière	Marketing, personnel, finance
Cégep de La Pocatière	Finance
Cégep de Lévis-Lauzon	Finance, gestion industrielle, gestion
Collège de Limoilou	Marketing, finance, gestion

Collège Lionel-Groulx	Marketing, finance, transport
Collège de Maisonneuve	Marketing, personnel, finance
Cégep Marie-Victorin	Gestion
Cégep de Matane	Finance
Collège Montmorency	Marketing, finance, gestion
Collège de l'Outaouais	Finance, gestion
Cégep de la région de l'Amiante	Finance, gestion
Cégep de Rimouski	Marketing, finance
Cégep de Rivière-du-Loup	Marketing, finance, gestion
Collège de Rosemont	Marketing, finance, gestion
Cégep de Saint-Félicien	Finance, gestion
Cégep de Saint-Hyacinthe	Finance
Cégep Saint-Jean-sur-Richelieu	Marketing, finance
Cégep de Saint-Jérôme	Finance, gestion
Cégep de Saint-Laurent	Marketing, finance
Cégep de Sainte-Foy	Marketing, finance, assurance
Cégep de Sept-Iles	Finance
Collège de Shawinigan	Finance
Collège de Sherbrooke	Marketing, finance, gestion
Cégep de Sorel-Tracy	Finance
Cégep de Trois-Rivières	Marketing, finance, gestion
Collège de Valleyfield	Marketing, finance, gestion
Vanier College	Finance, gestion
Cégep de Victoriaville	Finance

Cégep du Vieux Montréal	Finance, assurance, gestion
PRIVATE SECTOR (subsidized)	
Campus Notre-Dame-de-Foy	Gestion du commerce international
Collège d'Affaires Ellis inc.	Gestion
Collège André-Grasset	Finance
Collège de l'Assomption	Finance
Collège LaSalle	Gestion
Collège de Lévis	Finance, assurance
Collège O'Sullivan de Montréal	Marketing

Institutions authorized to offer programs leading to a DEC in*Cooperation* (413.01)

List of institutions	**Program**
PUBLIC SECTOR	
Cégep Marie-Victorin	Cooperation
PRIVATE SECTOR (subsidized)	
Collège André-Grasset	Cooperation
Collège Laflèche	Cooperation
Collège de Lévis	Cooperation
Séminaire de Sherbrooke	Cooperation

Notes

1. COMMISSION D'ÉVALUATION DE L'ENSEIGNEMENT COLLÉGIAL, *General Guide to the Evaluation of Programs of Studies by the Commission d'évaluation de l'enseignement collégial*, Gouvernement du Québec, May 1994, 26 p.

2. Members of the advisory body are listed in Appendix 1.

3. See *Specific Guide to the Evaluation of Programs of Studies Leading to an Attestation of College Studies (AEC) in the Business Administration Technology (410.00) and Cooperation (413.00) Sectors*, Québec City, Gouvernement du Québec, April 1996.

4. The description of the *Business Administration Technology* (410.12) and the *Administration et coopération*(413.01) programs is published in the *Cahiers de l'enseignement collégial.*

5. The Lennoxville, St-Lambert and St. Lawrence campuses of the Champlain Regional College are each counted as separate institutions.

6. MINISTÈRE DE L'ÉDUCATION DU QUÉBEC, Direction générale de la formation professionnelle et technique, *Administration, commerce et informatique Portrait de secteur*, Québec City, June 1995 revised version, 6 booklets (1 per division).

7. The *commerce* division corresponds to the *marketing* option of the *Business Administration Technologies*program leading to a DEC, while the *management* division corresponds to the *management, gestion industrielle* and *personnel* options of this program.

8. MINISTÈRE DE L'ÉDUCATION DU QUÉBEC, Direction de la recherche et du développement, Service des études et du développement des collèges, *Les programmes à l'enseignement ordinaire, à temps complet, de 1988 à 1993 - Quelques observations*, avril 1994, 597 p.

9. Taken from the 1994 version of CHESCO (*MEQ-DGEC information system on the progression through school of college students*). The students counted by this system are those enrolled full-time or part-time in the regular education system. The statistics used are those taken from colleges in the public system. The rate considered is the graduation rate for a given program in a given college.

10. Sources: DGEC, MEQ, *La relance au collégial*, 1991-1995 editions.

11. Appendix 2 lists the institutions authorized to offer the program leading to a DEC in the *Business Administration* and *Cooperation* sectors.

12. For the remainder of the text, the term "option" applies to the *Business Administration Technology* program (410.12).

13. See COMMISSION d'évaluation de l'enseignement collégial, *General Guide to the Evaluation of Programs of Studies by the Commission d'évaluation de l'enseignement collégial*, Gouvernement du Québec, May 1994, 26 p.

14. The terms "*full-time*" and "*part-time*" refer to the teacher's status in the college. The "*hourly-paid teachers*" category applies to staff who are paid based on the services they offer.

15. Colleges which do not belong to a regional admission service may present this data by school year rather than by cohort, if the latter are not available.

16. Or for the 1991-1192 school year; in this case, for the other two cohorts, indicate the results for the 1992-1993 and 1993-1994 school years.

17. Use the CHESCO method (MEQ-DGEC information system on the progression through

school of college students).

18. Number of enrollments in third term/number of enrollments in first term.

19. Number of graduates/number of enrollments in first term.

20. If this data is not available for the 1993 cohort, use the enrollment rate for a sixth consecutive term (please specify).

21. Cohort A includes first-time college students who have enrolled directly upon graduating from secondary school.

22. Cohort B includes all other students.

23. The percentage is calculated in relation to the number of students enrolled in the first term.

24. Implies a continuous presence in the program.

25. For the *Administration et coopération* program, indicate, where possible, the pass rate for all the courses in the specific program component, or for the courses prescribed by the Minister.

26. If this data is not available for the 1993 cohort, use the enrollment rate for a sixth consecutive term (please specify).

27. "A college shall adopt and make public, in whatever form it deems appropriate, a description of the objectives, standards and learning activities for each program it offers.

The program description shall be distributed to students upon their admission to the program."

This document was prepared in collaboration with the advisory body on the evaluation of the *Business Administration Technology* and *Cooperation* programs assisted by :

Pierre Côté
Alice Dignard
Yves Prayal
Denis Savard
Paul Vigneau
Secretary : Éliette Harvey

Portal Québec

Copyright: ©Commission d'évaluation de l'enseignement collégial. Reproduction of site texts is authorized provided the source is mentioned. General information: info@ceec.gouv.qc.ca. Site management: admin@ceec.gouv.qc.ca.

Home Page

BEST COPY AVAILABLE